



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

when justified on the ground of self-defense." This ghastly institution, inherited out of savagery, must go the way of other human perversions, dueling, witchcraft, thumbikin, lynching, slavery, prize-fighting, and the rack.

III.

THE GREAT FACT OF LIFE.

Let us look for a moment at war from its relation to the basic principle of life.

The great fact of life is that life exists primarily that there may be more life. Every tree-bud, every field-flower, every child sent to school, every teacher of children, every social worker of the world, every courtship and marriage, every law, institution, invention is an attestation of this great fact of life struggling to produce more life. Our every experience teaches this.

Most superficially seen, the past witnesses our earliest ancestors pursuing their long creep toward a fuller life, toward this ultimate conception, unable to use tools or fire, developing slowly the notion of family, frequently fighting literally tooth and nail, mere savages in the human scale. Thus they began—"savages." Then we find cunning creeping gradually into the ends of their fingers, rude tools extending the length of their arms, wild weapons expanding their powers of conquest, the families uniting into clans; no longer "savages," we say—still fighting, to be sure, but "barbarians." Later, clans multiply into cities, the efficiency of weapons increases, the spirit of competition grows stronger; men still live under the rule that might is right and wage war against each other, unpeopling the world by sword and feud, one year of peace for fourteen years of war—and we call that "civilization."

But our great principle of life began to lead men out of savagery, out of barbarism, out of mere civilization. A new hope beckoned them, a larger revelation. They saw themselves "members one of one another." They beheld themselves related, consciously or unconsciously, with each other around the globe. Their ideal, therefore, began to become the ideal of a universal solidarity. Under the prime principle of life the doctrine of strife gave way for them gradually, very gradually, but surely, to a creative belief in a great mutuality, in a limitless human interrelation and a world-wide co-operation.

So we of today learn more readily and convincingly of a world brotherhood. We believe increasingly that we needs must base our institutions upon this great fact of life—that life exists that there may be more life on the whole and in the long run, for of such we hold is the supreme teaching of Christianity. It is out of such that history slowly evolves for us a faith in a still more glorious march toward the world's "gleam"—toward a new "humanism" indeed, international, world-wide, and righteous. Life is that there may be more life. Wars are inconsistent with this most fundamental of all laws; hence wars are outlawed and foreordained to cease.

(To be continued.)

The October number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* will have a generous report of the Twentieth International Peace Congress.

Open Letter from Norman Angell.

The following letter, recently sent to the Boston *Herald* by Norman Angell, will be of interest to our readers:

"In his speech yesterday Colonel Roosevelt showed very clearly the great need, if our civilization is to endure and improve, for abiding by law—showed that even when we believe ourselves to be the victims of some grave injustice we must not take the law into our own hands and make ourselves judge and executioner, imposing our own view of the case by force and violence. Here are his words:

"This is a country in which the people set themselves with face like flint against anarchy. * * * The flag I see here in this hall is the flag of my country and yours, and there is no room in this country for the red flag of anarchy. The evils that exist we correct in orderly fashion. We will not tolerate murders or assaults as a method of correcting them, whether perpetrated with dynamite or with a revolver, or with whatever form of activity the assassin adopts.

"If they tell us that lawlessness and brutal violence are to be pardoned because it is done in the name of a cause, we reply that we will not have any repetition of the Paris commune. The man who wishes to reorganize society shall not do it in a way to plunge us into a welter of chaos."

"I do not think I have ever heard a more emphatic statement of the case for law and order—which in international politics we call arbitration—as against force and anarchy—which in international politics is war.

"We must all be delighted at the statement that even when evils arise, even when some one does us an injury, we must correct them 'in orderly fashion,' and that lawlessness and violence are not to be pardoned because they are done in the name of a 'cause.' And if these principles are sound, surely the sacred cause of country, of patriotism, must not be sullied by lawlessness and brutal violence; that such things are great and firm enough to stand on justice, not on the 'methods of the Paris commune;' that if it is wrong for the citizen to be judge and executioner all in one, and decide his own case, still more wrong must it be to base the cause of his country on the savage principles which, as between individuals, make civilization impossible.

"With what stupefaction, therefore, immediately after the passage just quoted, does one read the following statement from the Colonel:

"I will never consent to arbitrate national questions of vital honor and national interests. What is more, I know my countrymen, and I know that they will not consent. Uncle Sam will never arbitrate a slap in the face, and in the last resort the navy is Uncle Sam's punch."

"But if each one of us says: 'I will not allow the court to decide in any difference concerning my interest or honor; I alone shall decide when I am insulted, and I shall use my gun when I consider that I am'—why, in that case what does the Colonel mean when he says that we should correct our wrongs in an orderly fashion, and 'not in a way to plunge us into a welter of chaos?' "It were to be wished that the Colonel would explain."